FILED

18 OCT 17 AM 11:50

The Honorable Timothy A. Bradshaw KING COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT CLERK

E-FILED

CASE NUMBER: 18-2-14942-8 SEA

4

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25 26 JAMES EGAN, individually,

Plaintiff,

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KING

v.

CITY OF SEATTLE, a Washington municipal corporation,

Defendant.

ARTHUR WEST,

Plaintiff,

v.

SEATTLE CITY COUNCIL, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 18-2-14942-8 SEA

NON-PARTY EMC RESEARCH, INC.'S NOTICE OF DISCRETIONARY REVIEW

CASE NO. 18-2-15000-1 SEA

Pursuant to RAP 5.1, Non-party EMC Research, Inc. ("EMC") seeks discretionary review by the Court of Appeals, Division I, of the Honorable Timothy A. Bradshaw's Written Supplemental Order Granting in part Plaintiff James Egan's Motion to Compel (Non-party) Compliance with Subpoena. Attached as **Exhibit A** to this Notice is a copy of the October 16,

1			
1	2018 Order. Attached as Exhibit B is the trial court's October 10 order, of which EMC seeks		
2	review solely with respect to the portion of the trial court's order granting the motion to compel		
3 4	compliance with subpoena.		
5			
6	DATED this 17th day of October, 2018.		
7	Bill B and I was different aug of Getober, 2010.	IMPACT LAW GROUP PLLC	
8		/s/ Jonah O. Harrison Jonah O. Harrison, WSBA #34576	
9		1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1400	
10		Seattle, WA 98101 Phone: (206) 792-5230	
11		Fax: (206) 452-0655 jonah@impactlawgroup.com	
12			
13		Counsel for EMC Research, Inc.	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			

NON-PARTY EMC RESEARCH, INC.'S NOTICE OF DISCRETIONARY REVIEW - 3 $\,$

IMPACT LAW GROUP PLLC 1325 FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 1400 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101 (206) 792-5230 • (206) 452-0655 FAX

	1 -		
1		PARTY/COUNSEL	DELIVERY INSTRUCTIONS
2		David N. Bruce, WSBA #15237	Hand Delivery
3		Stephen C. Willey, WSBA #24499	Certified Mail E-service via e-filing portal
		Michele L. Stephen, WSBA #39458 1425 Fourth Avenue, Suite 800	E-service via e-filing portal pursuant to King County LGR 30
4		Seattle, WA 98101	E-mail U.S. Mail
5		dbruce@sbwllp.com	U.S. Mail
		swilley@sbwllp.com	
6		mstephen@sbwllp.com	
7		Co-counsel for Defendants	
8		Arthur West	Hand Delivery
9		120 State Avenue N.E., #1497 Olympia, WA 98501	Certified Mail E-service via e-filing portal
		awestaa@gmail.com	E-service via e-filing portal pursuant to King County LGR 30
10		un term e gamait eau	E-mail
11		Pro Se Plaintiff	U.S. Mail
12			
13		DATED this 17th day of October, 2018 at Se	eattle, Washington.
14			
15		IMPA	CT LAW GROUP PLLC
16		/o/ Toui	i Hannia
17		787 1071 Tori Ha	<u>i Harris</u> arris
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			

SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR COUNTY OF KING

JAMES EGAN,

Plaintiff,

VS.

CITY OF SEATTLE.

Defendant.

No. 18-2-14942-8 SEA

SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL (NON-PARTY) COMPLIANCE WITH SUBPOENA

This matter supplements the Court's Order of 10/10/18 on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel.

IT WAS ORDERED that the Motion was Denied in Part, Granted and Deferred in part.

The remaining issue, held in abeyance, concerned the production of the online presentation¹ shared with councilmembers. The Court found the presentation to councilmembers and staff potentially highly relevant to this case as it may characterize, and imbue with (OPMA) meaning, the urgency and activities at issue. The court further founds that the need for the online presentation would be informed by the City's subsequent disclosures, if any², and this Court's rulings on the related motions to be heard October 15, 2018.

¹ Not the underlying research methodologies and proprietary systems, etc.

² Which may obviate the need for any production from EMC.

At the hearing, the City represented and confirmed that neither it nor its employees are in custody of any such materials. Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that third-party EMC Research, Inc. is to produce the material³ within three days.

SO ORDERED this 16th day of October, 2018.

Hon. Timothy A. Bradshaw

³ And subject to appropriate confidentiality provisions, if any.

SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR COUNTY OF KING

JAMES EGAN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CITY OF SEATTLE,

Defendant.

Plaintiff,

No. 18-2-14942-8 SEA

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL (NON-PARTY) COMPLIANCE WITH SUBPOENA

This matter came before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel and the Court having considered all pleadings, declarations, and exhibits in this matter,

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion is Denied in Part, Granted and Deferred in part.

The subpoena at issue, a matter of record, was served upon a non-party, namely EMC Research, Inc., and pursued five areas (items 1 and 2 appear duplicative), including 1) "polling results," 3) "all forms of documentation related," "popularity polls," 4) all communications with an elected member of the City of Seattle," 5) "communications shared with David Rolf and Nick Hanauer", and 6) "consulting contracts." Responsive Declarations filed by EMC have since clarified its relationship with defendant and the potentially producible material at bar: EMC was not retained by the City or a City Official on the head tax issue; and its interaction was confined to an "online presentation" as copies of the polling data were not shared.

¹ The client is the PAC Bring Home Seattle, not councilmembers.

Ш

Tailoring competing interests and concerns, the Court DENIES, generally, Plaintiff's Motion regarding the above subpoenaed items as overbroad, encroaching upon proprietary business material and billing/fee structure, and communications with clients involving the non-party associational privilege. Those aspects of the propounded subpoena are therefore guashed.

The remaining issue, thus, becomes the production of the online presentation² shared with councilmembers which turns on it's a) materiality and b) the ability of obtaining the information by other means. The Court finds that the presentation to councilmembers and staff is potentially highly relevant to this case as it may characterize, and imbue with (OPMA) meaning, the urgency and activities at issue. The court further finds that the need for the online presentation will be informed by the City's subsequent disclosures, if any³, and this Court's rulings on the related motions to be heard October 15, 2018. In this specific respect, the Motion is GRANTED, and held in abeyance.

SO ORDERED this 10th day of October, 2018.

lon. Timothy A. Bradshaw

² Not the underlying research methodologies and proprietary systems, etc.

³ Which may obviate the need for any production from EMC.